Dear Howard,

5/3/75

Your book came day before yesterday.

I appreciate the inscription very much.

I read through the introduction the first night and the first chapter yesterday while Lil was grocery shopping. (I'm getting along better than well and no longer have apprehensions about driving. My reactions have returned to normal, etc., there is no lung damage from the new X-rays and I'll just have to take it easy in physical activity until I can return to my former level.)

While I like all of it very much, the fairness of treatment and the warmth and kindness of the inscription, etc., most of all I like something else: the influence I've had on the way you think. No, maybe I like more the directness and the honesty, your agreement that most of all the writer owes the obligation of declaring himself to the reader. For most people this is a more difficult kind of honesty. Anyway, it is all quite gratifying.

I see in your introduction what your law prof was talking about and what was not as clear in conversation: you have learned the direct way of getting to the essence and of getting to a context that happen to believe is the correct one. This will, I am certain, make you a more effective and a better lawyer.

It is all quite satisfying! I knew your thoughts, but I'm very happy to see the way your mind works.

When both Wisconsin and the local college expressed an interest in my files for an archive, this is the reason I preferred the local college, to be able to have direct contact with young students and to be able to show them a different approach, one not taught. (I don't know if I ever told you, but years ago my last job in intelligence was to do for the Phils what they found it impossible to do.

You have also remembered what I'd forgotten, in toto or in part, about Lane and Epstein in part and entirely about Popkin: their doctrine. This will be valuable if and when 3M gets around to replenishing my supply of copying paper because I have decided to try to do the sheep and goats bits. I prepared a speech for this for the NYU symposium. Jim had to read it for me under the worst of conditions, not the least of which was one of the others turning off the videotape as soon as he began to speak. This also cut off his light for reading. And they switched him from second until last, when may people had left. But it is having its effect. Two of the sponsors who were turned off both spent an hour with me on the phone two or three days later when they had time to think and to get reaction. Jerry P. yesterday told me that he is beginning to get reaction from those not there, as far away as the west coast. I think he mentioned Hoch and Lifton. For an audience of only 200 not bad. The WxPost carried a couple of grafs and I understand there is much in the current Village Voice. Yesterday Anson phoned me with what amounts to a long apology for his piece in New Times. (He even asked me for help in the future and on an approach he is taking now.) SO, I'll be copying some of the quotes you use and adding some I recall and some work I've done for the next time I do this kind of think. It may be soon.

While I've not been able to do much else I've done a little thinking. I've decided I waited too long for this separation of the self-promoters and commercializers. I have always avoided this in public. I should have accepted the invitation to go to Boston and I should have done it there. It would have given two more months of time and we may be running out of time.

What makes me aware of this is a press conference Bud, Cyril, Bob Smith, Joling and Herb McDonnell are holding in DC Monday, and there is no working day between now and then. Jim, Jerry and I all feel they will, through Cyril, rip off my work on the spectro and NAA. I have not used it because it is premature: I have not been given all and it is necessary to perfect the record. (Jim was superb on this in court yesterday

when he had a judge of honest conservatism rather than a finky liberal!)

I have proof from what they have given me that they are withholding after Kelley's assurance in writing of compliance and the verabl assurance I got Jim to extract from the USAtty and that the same character gave the judge yesterday. Jim was great. He fugured out his own and magnificently subtle way of saying this without giving away what I've got. He did it with the lies the AEC wrote us instead and it worked.

What I have is enough to destroy the case if given attention. But what is more significant is that they never really did either test. I don't want some self-seekers ruining my chance to establish this. I think it can make the definitive difference and it is my plan to use it that way. A Judiciary member has been in touch and I'd had that means more or less in mind, plus a press conference already discussed with a wire service, the WxPost and a network.

Until last night I was boxed in because I had no way of disclosing how I knew of this coming press conference except from one against whom there could be retaliation. Now I know another way and can make some efforts without fear of hurting the ~~xjmmx~~ innocent. Not much time to do something indirectly.

Kelley should have sent Cyril something. Not only does Cyril never understand but he doesn't care. He wants publicity only. His interview in the Pittsburgh Press of 4.25 is even more sickening than earlier ones. I sent McDonnell what they gave me initially on the spectro and asked him to be my expert. He never responded to me but told Jim he could not be- without returning anything.

There is nothing to keep Cyril from using this incompleteness as though it were complete and from grabbing not as much the credit as the future attention on this, which would be a magnified disaster because I fear he is headed toward one on the brain. He has no ethics. (If they no longer use it in law school, you may want to remember the wisdom of "Penis er ectus sciam non habet")

I'll work out how I'll contend with this, if I can. Maybe by being at their press conference. Armed. It'll take a little work but I can do it. How I could use the kind of help you've supplied on this!

What happened at the calendar hearing yesterday is that the judge, well prepared, gave the government nothing but trouble. He laid it out that he was familiar with the legislative history. Even ENK's part! (Not a reporter there.) Were they still holding that I was not entitled to this data? No. They had given me all. Jim answered this. They would give me affidavits. Him perfected his answer with the AEC bit and said he had interrgoatories prepared. They would give me affidavits instead. No, the judge said, if you are willing to respond under oath there is no reason not to do this in the form of interrgoatories rather than affidavits. (You can see that they chose what to say in affidavits and I what I want to know in interrgoatories.) They'd like a month more. The judge said he'd given two extensions and they'd given him nothing in that time. He'll have another ~~xx~~ calendar hearings 5/20.

How I don't know but the judge even knew I am broke! How could I afford Jim? Jim is getting no fee. All in the record. Jim wants to get a transcript but I fear spending even pennies.

When I could I've been working on this all week. I did stop when I wearied. In fact, I started before I went to NYC. I've a long document to read and send Jim but when there was no time for this long one I did enough by phone, several conversations. He did roughs, read them to me and I added. I think the first set will be more than merely adequate. I've not seen them. I guess Jim worked through the night Thursday to get these perfected and retyped.

I've really got them hooked if the hookers will stop lying their trade. So hooked that I don't even need an expert to read the results. More comprehensibly than with the technical, too, not that I am not still seeking a technical reading/interpretation of what results they did give me. Gotta get to other things. Thanks very much and best of luck?